

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 25, 2007.

Claims 1, 12, 23, and 27 are amended, and no claims are cancelled or added; as a result, claims 1-32 remain pending in this application.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for an interview on October 3, 2007. At the interview, it was discussed that amendments to the pending claims consistent with proposed claim amendment 1.0 would likely avoid the currently cited art, but that a further search may be required. Applicant has therefore amended claims 1, 12, 23, and 27 based on the proposed claim amendment 1.0.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 1 was objected to because of the following informalities: "gaming module" in line 2 should be --a gaming module--. Correction has been made

### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 12-17, 20, 22, 27 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant notes that the method claims in question are not means plus function claims, and cannot be construed as such. Nevertheless, applicant has added a speaker element to claims 12 and 27 to expedite resolution of this matter.

Claims 12-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Applicant points out that the recited "reporting game technical information of the computerized gaming system to a game administrator" meets the Examiner's provided definition of communication between wagering game machine and human operator. The interface element is further reinforced by the introduction of a speaker element into the relevant claims, as described above.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0072611 A1) in view of Murphy et al. (U.S. 5,896,129).

Wolf describes a gaming system having a dynamic menu system operable to perform various functions, including setup, configuration, and diagnostic functions as illustrated in Figures 22-26.

Murphy describes an audio menu for an in-flight entertainment system to facilitate a blind passenger's use of the entertainment system. The audio menu is driven such as through a passenger control handset having a Braille interface to a blind user.

Applicant's claims, as amended, recite an audio module not simply operable to convey a menu via audio, but are operable to provide an audible voice to the game administrator that conveys game technical information in certain circumstances relating to the state of the wagering game machine. More specifically, the audio system described in the claims is not a handicapped-accessible system that simply repeats menu information in audio rather than via video, but is operable to provide specific game technical information under circumstances related to the gaming machine environment, such as when the primary display is inoperable or another wagering game malfunction or configuration event occurs.

Because some elements of the pending claims, such as conveying game technical information via voice as a result of a wagering game machine malfunction or configuration activity are not contemplated in either reference, reexamination and allowance of these pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 349-9581 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

JACEK A GRABIEC


By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 349-9581

Date

Oct 15 07

By



John M. Dahl

Reg. No. 44,639

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 15 day of October 2007.

Name

Peter Rubuffen

Signature

